



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/529,059 04/07/00 ROSS

J 2000-0107A

WENDEROTH LIND & PONACK  
2033 K STREET NW  
SUITE 800  
WASHINGTON DC 20006

PM82/1019

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3635

DATE MAILED:

10/19/00

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/529,059

Applicant(s)

ROSS, JAMES CAMERON

Examiner

Chi Q. Nguyen

Art Unit

3635

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 April 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 07 July 2000 is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☒ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been:
1. ☒ received.
2. ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code / Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. & 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

- 15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 20) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Drawings*

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because they fail to show element 10 (mounting tab) in Figure 5 as described in the specification. Any structural detail that is essential for a proper understanding of the disclosed invention should be shown in the drawing. MPEP § 608.02(d). Correction is required.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-7, 10-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hagopian in view of Dameron.

Regard to the article claims 1-7, 10-14, Hagopian discloses the interconnecting lock panel for siding comprising:

A panel (10) includes a face (14), first folded edge (16), first channel (40), a slot (22) for receipt of a fastener (24), a closed loop (34), a second fold edge (26), disposed oppositely of the first edge. A flange (28), also comprising a gripping portion, second channel (46) as shown in Figures 2, 3.

Hagopian does not disclose expressly a series of longitudinally extending ribs.

Dameron teaches an improved roof panel apparatus and panel locking method, which included a reinforcement rib (27) as shown in the Figure 1.

Art Unit: 3635

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the panel of Hagopian with the series of longitudinally extending ribs of Dameron to have provided more rigid and stronger roof panel.

4. Claims 8, 9, 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hagopian in view of Dameron.

Regarding the method claims using the interlocked roof panels, Hagopian discloses the basic structural elements of the interconnected panel. However, Hagopian lacks to show the method of installation. Dameron further teaches the steps of installation in the claims 5 and 6 (columns 5-6). Hagopian and Dameron are analogous art because they are from a similar problem solving area. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have the installation method as a guide to install the interlocked panels. Therefore, the above claims are considered to be met by both disclosures Hagopian and Dameron.

***Conclusion***

5. Any questions concerning to this application should be directed to Chi Q. Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 605-1224, Monday-Thursday (7:00-5:00), Fridays off, or my primary examiner Beth Stephan at (703) 308-2485.

CN

10/16/2000

*Beth Stephan*  
BETH A. STEPHAN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER